

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Claims 3-17 and 20 are pending. The Examiner stated on page 9 of the Action that claims 17-20 are allowable subject matter.

Entry of the amendments is requested to reduce the issues on appeal. Claim 17 was indicated as allowable. Claims 3-6 and 8-13 are amended to depend from claim 17; claims 18-20 are canceled because they duplicate claims 6, 9 and 13. Grammatical errors in claims 3 and 13-14 that do not change their scope are also corrected.

35 U.S.C. 102 – Novelty

A claim is anticipated only if each and every limitation as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of Calif.*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is claimed. See *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claims 1-4, 6 and 11-12 were rejected under Section 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Tamamura et al. (U.S. Patent 4,559,112). Applicants traverse because all of the pending claims depend from claim 17 and, therefore, include the limitations of an independent claim that the Examiner stated on page 9 of the Action defines over the prior art of record.

Withdrawal of the Section 102 rejection is requested because all limitations of the claimed invention are not disclosed by the cited reference.

35 U.S.C. 103 – Nonobviousness

To establish a case of prima facie obviousness, all of the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. See M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

Claims 5 and 8-10 were rejected under Section 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Tamamura et al. in view of Nakama et al. (U.S. Patent 5,126,017). Applicants traverse because all of the pending claims depend from claim 17 and, therefore, include

the limitations of an independent claim that the Examiner stated on page 9 of the Action defines over the prior art of record.

Claim 7 was rejected under Section 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Tamamura et al. Applicants traverse because all of the pending claims depend from claim 17 and, therefore, include the limitations of an independent claim that the Examiner stated on page 9 of the Action defines over the prior art of record.

Claim 13 was rejected under Section 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Tamamura et al. in view of JP 2-18423. Applicants traverse because all of the pending claims depend from claim 17 and, therefore, include the limitations of an independent claim that the Examiner stated on page 9 of the Action defines over the prior art of record.

Withdrawal of the Section 103 rejections is requested because the invention as claimed would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time it was made.

Conclusion

Having fully responded to all of the pending objections and rejections contained in this Office Action, Applicants submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and earnestly solicit an early Notice to that effect. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if any further information is required.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By:


Gary R. Tanigawa
Reg. No. 43,180

901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100